

III. REMARKS

Claims 1-9 remain pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1 and 4 have been amended. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Entry of this Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. 1.116(b) because the Amendment: (a) places the application in condition for allowance as discussed below; (b) does not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration; and (c) places the application in better form for appeal. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request entry of this Amendment.

In the Office Action, claims 1-3 and 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(c) as allegedly being anticipated by Gune (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0204427), hereafter “Gune”, incorporating by reference (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0189600), hereafter “Gune 600”. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Gune, incorporating by reference Gune 600 in view of Applicants’ alleged admissions.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the telephone interview of October 7, 2010, with their representative, Hunter E. Webb. No proposed amendment was submitted in advance of the interview. In the interview, Applicants’ representative discussed the claimed invention in view of Gune. The Examiner recommended limitations, which are included in the above claims as amended, that would overcome the Gune reference. The Examiner agreed with Applicants that inclusion of the limitations included herein would overcome the rejection based on Gune.

A. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-3 AND 5-9 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection over Gune, Applicants assert that Gune does not disclose each and every feature of the claimed invention. For example, with respect to claim 1, Applicants submit that Gune fails to disclose dynamically generating an approval list for the item request based on application of a set of rules to the item, the approval list being a hierarchy of approvers from which approval must be obtained. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

With respect to the Office's other arguments regarding dependent claims, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. Furthermore, Applicants submit that all dependant claims are allowable based on their own distinct features. Since the cited art does not disclose each and every feature of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

B. REJECTION OF CLAIM 4 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection over Gune in view of Applicants' alleged admissions, Applicants assert that the cited references do not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claim listed above. In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that Gune also fails to teach or suggest automatically communicating, based on receipt of the at least one item request, an approval message to the approver prior to the logging step, wherein the

approval message informs the approver of the at least one item request requiring approval.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw its rejection.

IV. CONCLUSION

In addition to the above arguments, Applicants submit that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicants reserve the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Hunter E. Webb/

Hunter E. Webb
Reg. No.: 54,593

Date: October 22, 2010

Hoffman Warnick LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)